arXiv:1109.2831v1 [quant-ph] 13 Sep 2011

Optimal generalized variance and quantum Fisher information

Géza Tóth[1,2,3] *and Dénes Petz*[4]

1 Department of Theoretical Physics, The University of the Basque Country, P.O. Box 644, E-48080 Bilbao, Spain
`toth@alumni.nd.edu`
2 IKERBASQUE, Basque Foundation for Science, E-48011 Bilbao, Spain
3 Research Institute for Solid State Physics and Optics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, P.O. Box 49, H-1525 Budapest, Hungary
4 Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics, Reáltanoda utca 13-15, H-1051 Budapest, Hungary

Abstract

We define the generalized variance based on requiring that (i) it equals the usual variance for pure states and (ii) it is concave. For a quantum system of any size, we show that the usual variance is the smallest generalized variance, which makes it optimal for using it in entanglement criteria based on uncertainty relations. Similarly, we define the generalized quantum Fisher information, replacing the requirement of concavity by convexity. For rank-2 density matrices, we show that the quantum Fisher information is the largest among generalized quantum Fisher informations. We relate our findings to the results of [D. Petz, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **35**, 79 (2003); P. Gibilisco, F. Hiai and D. Petz, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **55**, 439 (2009)].

1 Introduction

Quantum entanglement is at the heart of quantum information science [1]. If a quantum state is entangled, it cannot be written as a convex sum of product states [2]. Such entangled states can be used for certain quantum information processing tasks (e.g., quantum cryptography, quantum teleportation), or for quantum metrology [3, 4]. To decide whether a quantum state is entangled is a very difficult problem, however. there are several powerful sufficient conditions for entanglement. Some of these conditions are linear in operator expectation values, which are called entanglement witnesses [5]. There are also entanglement criteria that are nonlinear in operator expectation values, such as variance based criteria and criteria based on the quantum Fisher information [3, 4, 6, 7, 8].

An abundance of entanglement conditions is known with the variance defined as [1, 6, 7, 8]

$$(\Delta A)^2_\varrho = \langle A^2 \rangle_\varrho - \langle A \rangle_\varrho^2. \tag{1}$$

where A is a Hermitian operator and ϱ is a density matrix. On the other hand, very recently several powerful entanglement conditions have been found with the quantum Fisher information [3, 4] defined as [3, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13]

$$F_Q^{\rm usual}[\varrho, A] = 2 \sum_{i,j} \frac{(\lambda_i - \lambda_j)^2}{\lambda_i + \lambda_j} |A_{ij}|^2. \tag{2}$$

In Ref. [14], it has been shown that it is possible to define generalized variances and generalized quantum Fisher informations. In fact, the two notions are closely connected as for every generalized variance there is a corresponding generalized quantum Fisher information. Thus, the question arises: Would it be possible to define entanglement conditions with these generalized quantities that are more powerful than the ones with the usual variance and the usual quantum Fisher information?

In this paper, we will show that the usual variance is the optimal one, which also explains why the entanglement conditions based on variances are so powerful. Thus, the entanglement conditions based on variances cannot be straightforwardly improved by replacing the usual variance by some other generalized variance. In the second part of the paper we define the generalized quantum Fisher information. The quantum Fisher information has also been used in entanglement conditions [3, 4]. For rank-2 density matrices, we also find that such conditions are optimal and replacing the usual quantum Fisher information by some other generalized quantum Fisher information cannot improve these conditions. However, for the general case for density matrices with a rank larger than 2 remains an open question.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. 2, we discuss entanglement detection based on variances and the quantum Fisher information. In Sec. 3, we discuss the case of generalized variances. In Sec. 4, we consider the generalized quantum Fisher information. In Sec. 5, we related our results to that of Ref. [14, 17].

2 Motivation: entanglement detection with variances and the quantum Fisher information

In this section we will describe entanglement criteria based on variances and the quantum Fisher information. Our motivation for the search for generalized variances is looking for the possibility for improving these conditions.

We will now summarize the basic ideas of entanglement detection based on variances as explained in Refs. [1, 6, 7, 8]. For a bipartite system, for a product state of the form $\varrho = \varrho_1 \otimes \varrho_2$ we have

$$(\Delta(A_1 \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes A_2))^2{}_{\varrho} = (\Delta A_1)^2{}_{\varrho_1} + (\Delta A_2)^2{}_{\varrho_2}. \tag{3}$$

Here, A_1 and A_2 act on the first and second subsystem, respectively. Let us know consider another set of operators, B_1 and B_2, acting on the same subsystems, fulfilling the uncertainty relations

$$(\Delta A_k)^2{}_{\varrho_k} + (\Delta B_k)^2{}_{\varrho_k} \geq L_k, \tag{4}$$

where L_k are some constants. Based on Eq. 3 and Eq. 4, for pure product states it is possible to bound an expression constructed as the sum of two variances as

$$\begin{aligned}(\Delta(A_1 \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes A_2))^2{}_{\varrho} + (\Delta(B_1 \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes B_2))^2{}_{\varrho}& \\ \geq L_1 + L_2.&\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Due to the concavity of the variance, Eq. (5) is valid also for separable states defined as the mixture of product states [2]

$$\sum_k p_k \varrho_k^{(1)} \otimes \varrho_k^{(2)}. \tag{6}$$

That is, any state violating Eq. (5) is entangled.

A very large literature exists on deriving entanglement conditions in this way. For a two-mode system, an example for such an entanglement condition is [8]

$$(\Delta(x \otimes \mathbb{1} - \mathbb{1} \otimes x))^2{}_{\varrho} + (\Delta(p \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes p))^2{}_{\varrho} \geq 2, \tag{7}$$

where we used the Heisenberg uncertainty relation rewritten for the sums of uncertainties

$$(\Delta x)^2{}_{\varrho_k} + (\Delta p)^2{}_{\varrho_k} \geq 1. \tag{8}$$

Here x and p are the canonical position and momentum operators.

For the derivation of the entanglement condition Eq. (5) we used two properties of the variance: (i) for pure states it equals the usual variance defined in Eq. (1) and (ii) it is concave. There are infinitely many quantities that fulfill these requirements, which we will call generalized variances in the next section. If we found one that is smaller than the variance Eq. (5) then we could construct stronger entanglement conditions.

That is, we might be able to find quantum states that do not violate Eq. (5) with the usual variance, but violate it with a generalized variance.

A similar derivation can lead to entanglement conditions based on the quantum Fisher information. We have to use again two properties of the quantum Fisher information [3]: (i) For pure states $F_Q^{\text{usual}}[\varrho, A] = 4(\Delta A)^2{}_{\varrho}$, and (ii) it is convex in the state. Let us now assume that for our bipartite system we know that for pure states we have

$$(\Delta A_k)^2{}_{\varrho_k} \leq M_k, \tag{9}$$

where M_k are some constants. Based on these, for pure product state we have

$$(\Delta(A_1 \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes A_2))^2{}_{\varrho} \leq M_1 + M_2, \tag{10}$$

Then, due to the convexity of the quantum Fisher information, for mixed separable states we have [3].

$$F_Q^{\text{usual}}[\varrho, A_1 \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes A_2] \leq M_1 + M_2. \tag{11}$$

Any state that violates Eq. (11) is entangled.

For example, a necessary condition for separability for a two-qubit system can be given as

$$F_Q^{\text{usual}}[\varrho, \sigma_x \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes \sigma_x] \leq 2, \tag{12}$$

where σ_x is Pauli spin matrix. For entangled state $(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, the left-hand side of Eq. (12) is the maximal 4.

As in the case of variances, we used only the basic properties of the quantum Fisher information in deriving our entanglement conditions, and there are several quantities that can be used in the place of the usual quantum Fisher information defined in Eq. (2). The entanglement conditions could be improved if there were a quantity that equals the usual quantum Fisher information for pure states, while it is larger than that for mixed states.

3 Generalized variances

In this section, we will define the generalized variance and the minimal generalized variance. We will also show that the minimal generalized variance is the usual variance Eq. (1).

Definition 1. Generalized variance $\text{var}_{\varrho}(A)$ is defined by two requirements:

1. For pure states, we have
$$\text{var}_{\Psi}(A) = (\Delta A)^2{}_{\Psi}.$$
2. For mixed states, $\text{var}_{\varrho}(A)$ is concave in the state.

There are infinitely many generalized variances that fulfill the requirements of Definition 1. Next, we will show that it is possible to identify the smallest one.

Definition 2. The minimal generalized variance $\mathrm{var}_\varrho^{\min}(A)$ is defined by two requirements:

1. For pure states, it equals the usual variance
$$\mathrm{var}_\Psi^{\min}(A) = (\Delta A)^2{}_\Psi, \tag{13}$$
2. For mixed states, it is defined through a *concave roof* construction [18]
$$\mathrm{var}_\varrho^{\min}(A) = \sup_{\{p_k,\Psi_k\}} \sum_k p_k (\Delta A)^2{}_{\Psi_k}, \tag{14}$$
where for each decompositions we have
$$\varrho = \sum_k p_k |\Psi_k\rangle\langle\Psi_k|. \tag{15}$$

It is clear that for any generalized variance, we have

$$\mathrm{var}_\varrho(A) \geq \mathrm{var}_\varrho^{\min}(A). \tag{16}$$

If this were not true, then it would be possible that by mixing pure states, the variance can get smaller than the average variance of the pure states, which would contradict to the concavity of the variance.

Next we will prove two lemmas that we need for proving the central theorem of the section.

Lemma 1. For rank-2 states, the minimal generalized variance is the usual variance
$$\mathrm{var}_\varrho^{\min}(A) = (\Delta A)^2{}_\rho. \tag{17}$$
In particular, this statement is true for all qubit states.

Proof. An important property of the usual variance $(\Delta A)^2$ is that
$$(\Delta A)^2{}_\varrho = \sum_k p_k \left[(\Delta A)^2{}_{\Psi_k} + (\langle A\rangle_{\Psi_k} - \langle A\rangle_\varrho)^2 \right],$$
where the term $(\Delta A)^2{}_{\Psi_k}$ can be called the "quantum part of the variance", while the $(\langle A\rangle_{\Psi_k} - \langle A\rangle_\varrho)^2$ term can be called the "classical part of the variance". If for any ϱ there is a decomposition $\varrho = \sum_k p_k|\Psi_k\rangle\langle\Psi_k|$ such that $\langle A\rangle_{\Psi_k} = \langle A\rangle_\varrho$ for all k then clearly $(\Delta A)^2$ fulfills Definition 2 for the minimal generalized variance. We will now show that such a decomposition always exists for rank-2 states.

Let us take an eigendecomposition of the state ϱ

$$\varrho = p|\Psi_1\rangle\langle\Psi_1| + (1-p)|\Psi_2\rangle\langle\Psi_2|. \tag{18}$$

Thus, in the $|\Psi_1\rangle$ and $|\Psi_2\rangle$ basis we can write

$$\varrho = \begin{bmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & 1-p \end{bmatrix}. \tag{19}$$

Let us define now the family of states

$$|\Psi_\phi\rangle = \sqrt{p}|\Psi_1\rangle + \sqrt{1-p}|\Psi_2\rangle e^{i\phi}. \tag{20}$$

In the $|\Psi_1\rangle$ and $|\Psi_2\rangle$ basis we can write

$$|\Psi_\phi\rangle\langle\Psi_\phi| = \begin{bmatrix} p & \sqrt{p(1-p)}e^{-i\phi} \\ \sqrt{p(1-p)}e^{+i\phi} & 1-p \end{bmatrix}. \tag{21}$$

For these states, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\Psi_\phi|A|\Psi_\phi\rangle &= p\langle\Psi_1|A|\Psi_1\rangle + (1-p)\langle\Psi_2|A|\Psi_2\rangle \\ &\quad + \sqrt{p(1-p)}\left(\langle\Psi_1|A|\Psi_2\rangle e^{i\phi} + h.c.\right). \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle\Psi_\phi|A|\Psi_\phi\rangle \\ &\quad = \langle A\rangle_\varrho + 2\sqrt{p(1-p)}\mathrm{Re}\left(\langle\Psi_1|A|\Psi_2\rangle e^{i\phi}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Clearly, there is an angle ϕ_1 such that $\mathrm{Re}\left(\langle\Psi_1|A|\Psi_2\rangle e^{i\phi_1}\right) = 0$. For this angle,

$$\langle\Psi_{\phi_1}|A|\Psi_{\phi_1}\rangle = \langle A\rangle_\varrho. \tag{24}$$

In the $|\Psi_1\rangle$ and $|\Psi_2\rangle$ basis we can write

$$\begin{aligned}&|\Psi_{\phi_1}\rangle\langle\Psi_{\phi_1}| \\ &\quad = \begin{bmatrix} p & \sqrt{p(1-p)}e^{-i\phi_1} \\ \sqrt{p(1-p)}e^{+i\phi_1} & 1-p \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

The same is true for $\phi_1+\pi$. In the $|\Psi_1\rangle$ and $|\Psi_2\rangle$ basis we can write

$$|\Psi_{\phi_1+\pi}\rangle\langle\Psi_{\phi_1+\pi}| \tag{26}$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} p & -\sqrt{p(1-p)}e^{-i\phi_1} \\ -\sqrt{p(1-p)}e^{+i\phi_1} & 1-p \end{bmatrix}. \tag{27}$$

The state ϱ can be decomposed as

$$\varrho = \frac{1}{2}\left(|\Psi_{\phi_1}\rangle\langle\Psi_{\phi_1}| + |\Psi_{\phi_1+\pi}\rangle\langle\Psi_{\phi_1+\pi}|\right), \tag{28}$$

and the two component states have $\langle\Psi_{\phi_1}|A|\Psi_{\phi_1}\rangle = \langle A\rangle_\varrho$ and $\langle\Psi_{\phi_1+\pi}|A|\Psi_{\phi_1+\pi}\rangle = \langle A\rangle_\varrho$. ☐

Lemma 2. Let us consider an eigendecomposition of a density matrix

$$\varrho_0 = \sum_{k=1}^{r_0} \lambda_k |\Psi_k\rangle\langle\Psi_k| \tag{29}$$

with all $\lambda_k > 0$. The rank of the density matrix is $r(\varrho_0) = r_0$. We consider density matrices for which $r_0 \geq 3$. Let us denote the expectation value of an operator A for ϱ_0 by A_0

$$\mathrm{Tr}(A\varrho_0) = A_{0.} \tag{30}$$

We claim that for any A, ϱ_0 can always be decomposed as

$$\varrho_0 = p\varrho_- + (1-p)\varrho_+, \tag{31}$$

such that $r(\varrho_-) < r_0$, $r(\varrho_+) < r_0$, and

$$\mathrm{Tr}(A\varrho_+) = \mathrm{Tr}(A\varrho_-) = A_0. \tag{32}$$

Proof. First, note that Eq. (30) can be rewritten as

$$\sum_k \lambda_k \langle\Psi_k|A|\Psi_k\rangle = A_{0.}. \tag{33}$$

Let us use the notation

$$a_k = \langle\Psi_k|A|\Psi_k\rangle. \tag{34}$$

With that, we have the condition

$$\sum_k a_k\lambda_k = A_0. \tag{35}$$

Moreover, from $\mathrm{Tr}(\varrho) = 1$, we have

$$\sum_k \lambda_k = 1. \tag{36}$$

Let us now define a family of states as

$$\varrho(c) = \sum_{k=1}^{r_0} (\lambda_k + c\Delta\lambda_k)|\Psi_k\rangle\langle\Psi_k| \tag{37}$$

such that

$$\sum_k a_k \Delta\lambda_k = 0 \tag{38}$$

and

$$\sum_k \Delta\lambda_k = 0. \tag{39}$$

We can rewrite Eq. (38) and Eq. (39) as

$$\begin{bmatrix} a_1 & a_2 & ... & a_{r_0-1} & a_{r_0} \\ 1 & 1 & ... & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \Delta\vec{\lambda} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{40}$$

For $r_0 \geq 3$, there is always a $\Delta\vec{\lambda} \neq 0$ fulfilling Eq. (38) and Eq. (39). It is clear that, if $\varrho(c)$ has non-negative eigenvalues, then $\varrho(c)$ is a physical state and

$$\mathrm{Tr}(A\varrho(c)) = A_{0.}. \tag{41}$$

Let us now examine the properties of the $\varrho(c)$ family. It is clear that

$$\varrho(0) = \varrho_0. \tag{42}$$

Moreover, it is also clear that around $c = 0$ there is some range of values for c, such that $\varrho(c)$ is physical. So first, let us start to increase c gradually from zero until one of the eigenvalues becomes zero. Let us denote this value by c_+. Thus, $\varrho(c)$ is physical for

$$0 \leq c \leq c_+. \tag{43}$$

We have $r(\varrho(c_+)) < r_0$. Moreover, $\varrho(c)$ is non-physical for $c > c_+$. A similar thing happens, if we start from $c = 0$ by decreasing c gradually until one of the eigenvalues becomes zero. Let us denote this value by c_-. Thus, $\varrho(c)$ is physical for

$$c_- \leq c \leq 0. \tag{44}$$

Again, we have $r(\varrho(c_-)) < r_0$. Moreover, $\varrho(c)$ is non-physical for $c < c_-$. In summary, for any choice of ϱ and $\Delta\lambda_k$ fulfilling Eq. (38) and Eq. (39), there is a family of states $\varrho(c)$ defined in Eq. (37) such that $\varrho(c)$ is physical for

$$c_- \leq c \leq c_+, \tag{45}$$

and $r(\varrho(c_+)) < r_0$, and $r(\varrho(c_-)) < r_0$. One can explicitly reconstruct these bounds as

$$c_+ = \min_k \frac{\lambda_k}{-\Theta(-\Delta\lambda_k)} \tag{46}$$

and

$$c_- = \min_k \frac{\lambda_k}{\Theta(\Delta\lambda_k)}, \tag{47}$$

where

$$\Theta(x) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x \geq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } x < 0. \end{cases} \tag{48}$$

Let us now construct the decomposition Eq. (31). Direct calculations can show that such a decomposition exists for

$$\varrho_- = \varrho(c_-), \tag{49}$$

$$\varrho_+ = \varrho(c_+), \tag{50}$$

and

$$p = \frac{c_+}{c_+ - c_-}. \tag{51}$$

□

After proving Lemma 1 and Lemma 2, we will prove the main theorem of the section.

Theorem 1. For systems of any dimension, the minimal generalized variance is the usual variance

$$\mathrm{var}_\varrho^{\min}(A) = (\Delta A)^2{}_\rho. \tag{52}$$

Proof. For rank-2 states, it is true because of Lemma 1. According to Lemma 2, any state with a rank larger than 2 can be decomposed into the mixture of lower rank states that have the same expectation value for A, as the original state has. The lower rank states can then be decomposed into the mixture of states with an even lower rank, until we reach rank-2 states. Thus, any state ϱ can be decomposed into the mixture of

$$\varrho = \sum p_k |\Psi_k\rangle\langle\Psi_k| \tag{53}$$

such that $\langle\Psi_k|A|\Psi_k\rangle = \mathrm{Tr}(A\varrho)$. Hence, similarly as in the proof of Theorem 1, the statement of Theorem 2 follows. □

We will present two examples in order to clarify certain issues concerning generalized variances.

Example 1. Let us consider the state

$$\varrho = \frac{1}{2}\left(|1\rangle\langle 1| + |-1\rangle\langle -1|\right). \tag{54}$$

For this state, we have $(\Delta\sigma_z)^2 = +1$. Let us look at the decomposition

1. $p_1 = \frac{1}{2}, |\Psi_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$,
2. $p_2 = \frac{1}{2}, |\Psi_2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle)$.

For this decomposition $(\Delta\sigma_z)^2{}_{\Psi_k} = +1$ and $\langle\Psi_k|\sigma_z|\Psi_k\rangle = \mathrm{Tr}(\sigma_z\varrho) = 0$. Thus, we presented a decomposition such that the expectation value of A is the same for both subensembles $|\Psi_k\rangle$.

Example 2. Let us consider the generalized variance

$$\mathrm{var}^{\mathrm{quartic}}{}_{\varrho}(A) = \mathrm{Tr}(A^2\varrho) - \mathrm{Tr}(A\varrho)^2 + \mathrm{Tr}(A^4(\varrho - \varrho^2)). \tag{55}$$

For pure states, it equals the usual variance. For mixed states, it is larger than that and it is concave in the state. It is in fact a sum of the usual variance and a quantity that is concave in the state and is zero for pure states. This idea can be used very efficiently to obtain many different generalized variances. A quite general formula for such variances is

$$\mathrm{var}^{\{\mathrm{c_{kl}}\}}{}_{\varrho}(A) = \mathrm{Tr}(A^2\varrho) - \mathrm{Tr}(A\varrho)^2 + \sum_{kl} c_{kl}\mathrm{Tr}(A^k\varrho^l), \tag{56}$$

where the constants c_{kl} are chosen such that $\sum_l c_{kl} = 0$ for all k and $\sum_{kl} c_{kl}\mathrm{Tr}(A^k\varrho^l)$ is concave in ϱ.

4 Generalized quantum Fisher information

In this section, we will define the generalized quantum Fisher information and the maximal generalized quantum Fisher information. We will show that for rank-2 density matrices, the maximal quantum Fisher information is the usual quantum Fisher information.

Definition 3. Generalized quantum Fisher information $F_Q[\varrho, A]$ is defined by two requirements:

1. For pure states, we have
$$F_Q[\varrho, A] = 4(\Delta A)^2{}_{\Psi}.$$
The factor 4 appears to keep the consistency with the existing literature [3].
2. For mixed states, $F_Q[\varrho, A]$ is convex in the state.

There are infinitely many generalized quantum Fisher in formations that fulfill the requirements of Definition 3. Next, we will show that it is possible to identify the largest one.

Definition 4. $F_Q^{\max}[\varrho, A]$ is defined by two requirements:

1. For pure states, it equals four times the usual variance
$$F_Q^{\max}[\varrho, A] = 4(\Delta A)^2{}_{\Psi}. \tag{57}$$
2. For mixed states, it is defined through a *convex roof* construction [18]
$$F_Q^{\max}[\varrho, A] = \inf_{\{p_k, \Psi_k\}} p_k(\Delta A)^2{}_{\Psi_k}. \tag{58}$$

It is clear that for any generalized quantum Fisher information, we have

$$F_Q[\varrho, A] \le F_Q^{\max}[\varrho, A]. \tag{59}$$

Next we will present the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 2. For rank-2 density matrices, $F_Q^{\max}[\varrho, A]$ is the usual quantum Fisher information defined in Eq. (2).

Proof. Let us consider a density matrix ϱ of rank-2 given as

$$\varrho = q|\phi_1\rangle\langle\phi_1| + (1-q)|\phi_2\rangle\langle\phi_2|, \tag{60}$$

and a self-adjoint observable A. We will show that for any ϱ and A exist a decomposition into a mixture of Q_k projectors of the form

$$\varrho = \sum_k p_k Q_k \tag{61}$$

such that

$$F_Q^{\text{usual}}[\varrho, A] = \sum_k p_k 4(\Delta A)^2{}_{Q_k}. \tag{62}$$

From Eq. (2), it is clear that

$$F_Q[\varrho, A] = F_Q[\varrho, \tilde{A}], \tag{63}$$

where

$$\tilde{A} = |A_{12}| \left(|\phi_1\rangle\langle\phi_2| + |\phi_2\rangle\langle\phi_1|\right) \tag{64}$$

and

$$A_{12} = \langle\phi_1|A|\phi_2\rangle. \tag{65}$$

Thus, in our computation only $|A_{12}|$ is essential, so we can reduce the problem to the two-dimensional space generated by $|\phi_1\rangle$ and $|\phi_2\rangle$, and instead of A, it is sufficient to consider the operator $\tilde{A}$. For the usual quantum Fisher information Eq.(2), we have

$$F_Q^{\text{usual}}[\varrho, \tilde{A}] = 4(2q-1)^2|A_{12}|^2. \tag{66}$$

For the right-hand side of Eq. (62) we have

$$\sum_k p_k 4(\Delta\tilde{A})^2{}_{Q_k} = 4[\text{Tr}(\varrho\tilde{A}^2) - \sum_k p_k \text{Tr}(Q_k\tilde{A})^2]. \tag{67}$$

Based on Eq. (63), Eq. (66), and Eq. (67), Eq. (62) can be rewritten as

$$4(2q-1)^2|A_{12}|^2 = 4\{\text{Tr}(\varrho\tilde{A}^2) - \sum_k p_k[\text{Tr}(Q_k\tilde{A})]^2\}. \tag{68}$$

This is the equality to be solved. Using that

$$\tilde{A}^2 = |A_{12}|^2 \left(|\phi_1\rangle\langle\phi_1| + |\phi_2\rangle\langle\phi_2|\right), \tag{69}$$

we obtain $\mathrm{Tr}(\varrho\tilde{A}^2)=|A_{12}|^2$. Substituting this into Eq. (68), we get

$$q(1-q)|A_{12}|^2=\sum_k p_k \mathrm{Tr}(Q_k\tilde{A})^2. \tag{70}$$

A simple decomposition of the form Eq. (61) for ϱ fulfilling Eq. (70) is given by

$$p_1=\frac{1}{2},\quad Q_1=\left[\begin{array}{cc} q & \sqrt{q(1-q)} \\ \sqrt{q(1-q)} & 1-q \end{array}\right], \tag{71}$$

and

$$p_2=\frac{1}{2},\quad Q_2=\left[\begin{array}{cc} q & -\sqrt{q(1-q)} \\ -\sqrt{q(1-q)} & 1-q \end{array}\right]. \tag{72}$$

□

5 Connections to the definitions of Ref. [14, 15]

In this section, first we will review how Refs. [14, 15] define the variances and quantum Fisher informations. We will denote them by vâr and $\hat{F}$, in order to distinguish them from the generalized variances and Fisher informations defined in this paper. Then, we will show that these definitions, apart from a constant factor, fulfill Definition 1 and Definition 3.

The basic idea of Refs. [14, 15] is that for each standard matrix monotone function $f:\mathbb{R}^+\rightarrow\mathbb{R}^+$, a generalized variance and a corresponding quantum Fisher information are defined. First, let us consider the generalized variances.

Definition 5. The variance according to Refs. [14, 15] is defined as

$$\hat{\mathrm{var}}_\varrho^f(A)=\langle A,\mathbb{J}_\varrho^f(A)\rangle-(\mathrm{Tr}\varrho A)^2, \tag{73}$$

with the normalization condition $f(0)=1$,

$$\mathbb{J}_\varrho=f(\mathbb{L}_\varrho{\mathbb{R}_\varrho}^{-1})\mathbb{R}_\varrho, \tag{74}$$

and

$$\mathbb{L}_\varrho(A)=\varrho A,\quad \mathbb{R}_\varrho(A)=A\varrho,$$

where A is Hermitian. It is also useful to define the mean based on f

$$m_f(a,b)=af(b/a) \tag{75}$$

and use it instead of f.

Next, we will review some concrete examples for generalized variances defined by the mean m_f.

Example 3. The most typical generalized variances are the following [14, 15]

1. For the arithmetic mean $m_f(a,b) = \frac{a+b}{2}$, we have the usual variance Eq. (1)
2. For the logarithmic mean $m_f(a,b) = \frac{b-a}{\log(b)-\log(a)}$, we have the Kubo-Mori-Boguliobov inner product
$$\hat{\mathrm{var}}_\varrho^{\mathrm{KMB}}(A) = \int_0^1 \varrho^t A \varrho^{1-t} A dt - (\mathrm{Tr}\varrho A)^2. \tag{76}$$
Note that this variance is zero for all pure states.
3. For the harmonic mean $m_f(a,b) = \frac{2ab}{b+a}$, we have
$$\hat{\mathrm{var}}_\varrho^{\mathrm{harmonic}}(A) = \int_0^\infty \mathrm{Tr}[A\exp(-t\varrho^{-1}/2)]^2 dt - (\mathrm{Tr}\varrho A)^2.$$

We will now prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3. For *pure* states
$$\hat{\mathrm{var}}_\varrho^f(A) = m_f(1,0) \times (\Delta A)^2. \tag{77}$$

Thus, for pure states the variance of Refs. [14, 15] equals the usual variance times a constant.

Proof. It can be shown that Eq. (73) can be rewritten as [15]
$$\hat{\mathrm{var}}_\varrho^f(A) = \sum_{ij} m_f(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) A_{ij}^* A_{ij} - |\sum \lambda_i A_{ii}|^2, \tag{78}$$

where λ_j are the eigenvalues of ϱ, and A is given in the basis of the eigenvectors of the density matrix. Hence, one can see that for pure states ($\lambda_1 = 1$, $\lambda_k = 0$ for $k \geq 2$) we have
$$\hat{\mathrm{var}}_\varrho^f(A) = \sum_{j>1} m_f(1,0) A_{1j}^* A_{1j}. \tag{79}$$

Hence, Eq. (77) follows. □

After we discussed the generalized variances, we will turn our attention to the quantum Fisher information.

Definition 6. The quantum Fisher information according to Refs. [14, 15] is defined as
$$\hat{F}^f(\varrho; A) = \mathrm{Tr}(A \mathbb{J}_f^{-1}(\varrho) A). \tag{80}$$

Again, the most important generalized quantum Fisher informations correspond to means appearing often in mathematics. We will review three of them, corresponding to the three means considered In Example 3 for variances.

Example 4. Some examples of the quantum Fisher informations are given next [14, 15]

1. For the arithmetic mean $m_f(a,b) = \frac{a+b}{2}$, the usual quantum Fisher information is defined as
$$\hat{F}^{\text{usual}}(\varrho; A) = \int_0^\infty \text{Tr}[\exp(-t\varrho/2)A\exp(-t\varrho/2)A]dt.$$
2. For the logarithmic mean $m_f(a,b) = \frac{b-a}{\log(b)-\log(a)}$, we have
$$\hat{F}^{\log}(\varrho; A) = \int_0^\infty \text{Tr}(D+t)^{-1}A(D+t)^{-1}Adt. \tag{81}$$
3. For the harmonic mean $m_f(a,b) = \frac{2ab}{b+a}$, we have
$$\hat{F}^{\text{harmonic}}(\varrho; A) = \text{Tr}(\text{D}^{-1}\text{A}^2).$$

It is worth to define the following notation
$$\hat{F}_Q^f[\varrho, A] = \hat{F}^f(\varrho, i[\varrho, A]). \tag{82}$$
With this definition, for the arithmetic mean $m_f(a,b) = \frac{a+b}{2}$, $\hat{F}_Q^f[\varrho, A]$ equals the usual quantum Fisher information Eq. (2) denoted in the physics literature as $F_Q[\varrho, A]$ [3].

Lemma 4. For pure states, we have
$$\hat{F}_Q^f[\varrho, A] = m_f(1,0) \times (\Delta A)^2. \tag{83}$$

Proof. Eq. (80) leads to [9]
$$\hat{F}^f(\varrho; A) = \sum_{i,j} \frac{1}{m_f(\lambda_i, \lambda_j)} |A_{ij}|^2, \tag{84}$$
where λ_j are the eigenvalues of ϱ, and A is given in the basis of the eigenvectors of the density matrix. With Eq. (82), we obtain
$$\hat{F}_Q^f[\varrho, A] = \sum_{i,j} \frac{(\lambda_i - \lambda_j)^2}{m_f(\lambda_i, \lambda_j)} |A_{ij}|^2. \tag{85}$$
For $m_f(a,b) = (a+b)/2$, we obtain the usual quantum Fisher information Eq. (2). The theorem can be proved substituting $\lambda_1 = 1$, $\lambda_k = 0$ for $k > 2$ into Eq. (85). □

Next, we will present the central theorems of this section.

Theorem 3. After appropriate normalization, the generalized variances defined in Refs. [14, 15] fulfill Definition 1. However, the opposite is not true. Not all generalized variances that fulfill Definition 1 belong to the generalized variances defined in Refs. [14, 15].

Proof. It has been proved that the generalized quantum Fisher informations of Ref. [14, 15] are convex and the generalized variances of Refs. [14, 15] are concave [16]. Based on this fact and Lemma 3, we see that

$$\frac{\hat{\mathrm{var}}_{\varrho}^{f}(A)}{m_f(1,0)} \tag{86}$$

is a generalized variance in the sense of Definition 1. At this point the question arises: Are the the two definitions equivalent? We find that this is not the case. Eq. (55) is a generalized variance according to Definition 1, but cannot be written in the form Eq. (73). On the other hand, Ref. [14, 15] defines a family of variances based on a single-variable function f, while Definition 1 does not provide an explicate formula for obtaining such quantities. □

Theorem 4. After appropriate normalization, the quantum Fisher informations defined in Ref.s [14, 15] fulfill Definition 3.

Proof. It has been proved that the generalized quantum Fisher informations of Ref. [14, 15] are convex. Moreover, based on Lemma 4, we can also see that

$$m_f(1,0)\hat{F}_Q^f[\varrho, A] \tag{87}$$

is a generalized quantum Fisher information in the sense of Definition 3. □

6 Conclusions

We have defined generalized variances and quantum Fisher informations. We have shown that the optimal variance is the usual variance for the entanglement detection task we considered since it is its own concave roof. We have also shown that the optimal quantum Fisher information is the usual quantum Fisher information for rank-2 density matrices. In other words, the quantum Fisher information is the convex roof of the variance for such matrices. These indicate why entanglement conditions based on variances and the quantum Fisher information can be so efficient. We related our findings to the generalized variances and quantum Fisher informations defined in Refs. [14, 17].

7 Acknowledgments

We thank O. Gühne and P. Hyllus for discussions. We thank the support of the ERC Starting Grant GEDENTQOPT, the Spanish MICINN (project No. FIS2009-12773-C02-02), the Basque Government (project No. IT4720-10), and the National Research Fund of Hungary OTKA (Contract No. K83858).

References

[1] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2009); O. Gühne and G. Tóth, Phys. Rep. **474**, 1 (2009).

[2] R.F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 4277 (1989).

[3] L. Pezzé and A. Smerzi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 100401 (2009).

[4] P. Hyllus, W. Laskowski, R. Krischek, C. Schwemmer, W. Wieczorek, H. Weinfurter, L. Pezzé, A. Smerzi, arXiv:1006.4366; G. Tóth, arXiv:1006.4368; R. Krischek, C. Schwemmer, W. Wieczorek, H. Weinfurter, P. Hyllus, L. Pezzé, and A. Smerzi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 080504 (2011).

[5] For entanglement witnesses, see M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **223**, 1 (1996); B.M. Terhal, Phys. Lett. A **271**, 319 (2000); M. Lewenstein, B. Kraus, J.I. Cirac, and P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 052310 (2000); D. Bruß, J.I. Cirac, P. Horodecki, F. Hulpke, B. Kraus, M. Lewenstein, and A. Sanpera, J. Mod. Opt. **49**, 1399 (2002).

[6] For entanglement detection based on local uncertainty relations, see H. F. Hofmann and S. Takeuchi, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 032103 (2003); O. Gühne, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 117903 (2004); G. Tóth, C. Simon, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 062310 (2003); G. Tóth, C. Knapp, O. Gühne, and H.J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 250405 (2007); O. Gühne, P. Hyllus, O. Gittsovich, and J. Eisert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 130504 (2007); O. Gittsovich, O. Gühne, P. Hyllus, and J. Eisert, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 052319 (2008).

[7] A.S. Sørensen, L.-M. Duan, J.I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, Nature (London) **409**, 63 (2001).

[8] L.-M. Duan, G. Giedke, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2722 (2000); R. Simon, ibid. **84**, 2726 (2000).

[9] P. Hyllus, O. Gühne, and A. Smerzi, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 012337 (2010).

[10] S.L. Braunstein and C.M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 3439 (1994).

[11] A. S. Holevo, *Probabilistic and Statistical Aspect of Quantum Theory* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1982).

[12] C.W. Helstrom, *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory* (Academic Press, New York, 1976).

[13] D. Petz, *Quantum Information Theory and Quantum Statistics* (Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, 2008).

[14] D. Petz, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **35**, 79 (2003).

[15] P. Gibilisco, F. Hiai and D. Petz, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **55**, 439 (2009).

[16] F. Hiai and D. Petz, arXiv:1009.2679.

[17] For a review on generalized variances, Fisher informations and covariances see D. Petz and C. Ghinea, Introduction to quantum Fisher information, QP-PQ: Quantum Probab. White Noise Anal., vol. 27. (Eds: R. Rebolledo and M. Orszag), World Scientific, 2011, 261-281.

[18] For the application of convex roofs in quantum information science see C. Benett, D. DiVincenzo, J. Smolin, and W. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824 (1996); S. Hill and W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 5022 (1997); W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998).